

96. Letter from Rep. Henry Waxman to Chairman Dan Burton (July 15, 1999).

97. Testimony of Chairman Dan Burton, House Rules Committee (July 15, 1999) (available at [www.house.gov/reform/oversight/99\\_07\\_15db-rules.htm](http://www.house.gov/reform/oversight/99_07_15db-rules.htm)).

98. See Letter from Russell J. Bruemmer, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, to Richard L. Huff, Co-Director, Office of Information and Privacy, Department of Justice (March 31, 1995).

99. Letter from Wallace H. Cheney, Assistant Director/General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, to Joseph M. Gabriel, Law Offices of Langberg, Leslie and Gabriel (March 2, 1995); Letter from Bonnie L. Gay, Attorney-in-Charge, FOIA/PA Unit, Executive Office of United States Attorneys, Department of Justice, to Joseph M. Gabriel (Dec. 15, 1994); See Letter from Magda S. Ortiz, FOIA/PA Reviewing Officer, Immigration and Naturalization Service, to Rebekah Poston (Dec. 6, 1994) (explaining that a potentially responsive record was illegible and requesting additional information); Letter from Russell J. Bruemmer, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, to Richard L. Huff, Co-Director, Office of Information and Privacy, Department of Justice (March 31, 1995) (explaining that the INS searched for, but ultimately could not find, a record responsive to the FOIA request).

100. Testimony of Richard Huff and Rebekah Poston, House Government Reform Committee, Felonies and Favors: A Friend of the Attorney General Gathers Information from the Justice Department, 129-31 (July 27, 2000) (stenographic record).

101. Testimony of John Schmidt and John Hogan, House Committee on Government Reform, Felonies and Favors: A Friend of the Attorney General Gathers Information from the Justice Department, 120-23, 128, 140-41 (July 27, 2000) (stenographic record).

102. Memorandum from Attorney General Janet Reno to staff of the Attorney General (Apr. 28, 1995).

103. House Committee on Government Reform, Felonies and Favors: A Friend of the Attorney General Gathers Information from the Justice Department, 154 (July 27, 2000) (stenographic record).

104. Morning Edition, National Public Radio (Aug. 31, 1999).

105. Letter from Chairman Burton to Attorney General Janet Reno (Sept. 10, 1999).

106. Fox News, Fox News Sunday (Sept. 12, 1999).

107. Letter from Rep. Henry Waxman to John Danforth, Special Counsel (Sept. 13, 1999); FBI FD-302 of FBI Agent (June 9, 1993) (reporting that a pilot heard "a high volume of [Hostage Rescue Team] traffic and Sniper [Tactical Operations Command] instructions regarding . . . the insertion of gas by ground units," including "one conversation, relative to utilization of some sort of military round to be used on a concrete bunker"); FBI H.R.T. Interview Schedule (Nov. 9, 1993) (summarizing an interview with an FBI agent and stating that "smoke on film came from attempt to penetrate bunker w/1 military and 2 ferret rounds" and further describing the military round as "Military was . . . bubblehead w/green base"); Handwritten notes (April 19, 1993) (making repeated references to military rounds fired on April 19, 1993, such as "smoke from bunker came when these guys tried to shoot gas into the bunker (military gas round)").

108. John C. Danforth, Special Counsel, Interim Report to the Deputy Attorney General Concerning the 1993 Confrontation at the Mt. Carmel Complex, Waco, Texas, 54 (July 21, 2000).

109. MSNBC, Watch It! With Laura Ingraham (Nov. 2, 1999).

110. John Huang Interview FD-302 at 19 (Jan. 19-Feb. 10, 1999).

111. John Huang Interview FD-302 at 129 (Feb. 23-March 26, 1999).

112. House Committee on Government Reform, Hearings on the Role of John Huang and the Riady Family in Political Fundraising, 104 (Dec. 15, 1999) (stenographic record).

113. *Id.* at 95.

114. House Committee on Government Reform, Hearings on the Role of John Huang and the Riady Family in Political Fundraising, 15-16 (Dec. 15, 1999) (stenographic record).

115. Letter from Chairman Dan Burton to Attorney General Janet Reno, 2 (July 18, 2000).

116. Justice Department Won't Discuss Gore Video, Reuters (July 21, 2000).

117. Fox, Hannity and Colmes (July 19, 2000).

#### HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND THE "NEW MAJORITY"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this time this afternoon to come before the House following the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

I have had an opportunity, since I came to Congress in 1993, to serve on the Committee on Government Reform. I came as a freshman Member in that year, in 1993, and served on that committee because I think it is a most important committee.

Many of my colleagues may not be familiar with the history of the Committee on Government Reform. It was called the Committee on Government Operations, and it has had several other names through its history. But I think the Committee on Government Reform is one of the most important committees in the House of Representatives and in the entire Congress. It has an interesting history that dates back to when our Federal government started building a bureaucracy.

After the Presidencies of Washington and Adams, in 1808, actually, Thomas Jefferson was quite alarmed by the bureaucracy building, he termed it, in Washington. He did not like the huge bureaucracy in his estimation that had been constructed previous to his taking office. The founding Members in the Congress, early Members at the turn of that century, the 19th century, again in 1808, created the predecessor of the Committee on Government Operations.

They did not trust the appropriators. They did not trust the authorizers. The authorizers would initiate a program, the appropriators would fund the program, and they wanted an additional check. All the checks and balances they put into our system of government are really incredible when we

think back that this was done some 200 years ago. They wanted a government that worked and also a government that had oversight and investigation responsibility.

So in 1808, they created the predecessor of the committee on which the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is the ranking member. He is the chief Democrat. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is the chairman of the full Committee on Government Reform. So from the very beginning of the House of Representatives and the Congress, and the beginning of our system and the checks and balances, our Founding Fathers wanted that committee. Again, it serves a very important purpose and that is to investigate, to conduct oversight independent of all the other committees.

We heard criticism of the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). I would say that no one has done a more admirable job. We have to look at the history of this Congress and we have to look at the history of administrations. There have been many administrations. I would venture to say that never in the history of the United States of America and our government have we had an administration that has had more scandals. They probably have had more scandals in the Clinton-Gore administration than we have had in the 20th century and the 19th century back to the founding of our government.

This administration has been riddled with scandals. I cannot even keep track of the number of scandals that we have had. And for a Member to come forward and criticize the chairman for his conduct of investigations and oversight, I think, is unfair, because he had a responsibility and a tough responsibility.

I submit, having served on that subcommittee, that never before had I seen anything like this, and I have been a student of government since high school days some many years ago. Again, in serving on the committee under the Democrat control of both the House, the Senate and the White House from 1993 to 1995, I saw how they ran that committee, and it did not serve its purpose well.

□ 1615

In fact, there was a great defect in that because the committee was run in a fashion unintended by the Founding Fathers. I remember coming to this floor and holding up a sign that said "55 to 5." And I will tell you how the other side ran the committee, the committee that kept us straight in the House of Representatives. Again holding up that chart that said "55 to 5," I said, my colleagues, that is not the score of a badly mismatched sporting event. That is how the Democrats ran the investigation and the oversight committee. They gave us five investigative staff and they kept 55. We did

not even have a chance. And they controlled the White House, the House and the other body; and that was not what the Founding Fathers intended.

So if you want to talk about misuse of one of the most important committees in the Congress or in the House of Representatives, merely look back in a reflective manner on how the other side operated this committee.

And time and time again, when I was in the minority, I came out and said, this is unfair, they should not run it in this fashion. And time and time again, they ran it in that fashion.

So to criticize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for his record in conducting oversight and investigations for the most scandal-ridden administration ever to set its face in Washington, and I will include Philadelphia and New York, and we could go back to the Continental Congresses where they met in Trenton, Annapolis, Harrisburg, and some dozen State capitals, there has never been an administration so racked with scandal. And it has been dumped in our lap.

Now, do you think that is a lot of fun? Do you think we came to Congress just to pick on the other side? No, we did not. We came here because the Founding Fathers set up this check and balance to make this system work.

There are some countries I found that have even adopted the Constitution of the United States of America. They have adopted the entire document. Yet they do not function like ours. And I submit one reason they do not have that additional check that the Founding Fathers established, such as we have with the investigations and oversight, is because we are always trying to cleanse the process.

Sure, we may make a few mistakes in the investigations. It is not intentional. Sure, we may have gotten some inadequate information. But let me tell my colleagues, when we were in the minority, I saw how they ran the show at least as far as investigations and oversight, and it was not anything to be proud of.

In fact, again, I came many times asking for reform. And we did institute that reform, and we shared staff on a more equitable basis so we could do an honest job in conducting oversight of the House of Representatives. But to come here today to criticize the chairman.

I have also served on the committee, and I have seen what we had to contend with. And you can talk about witnesses, you can talk about Webb Hubbell who served time in prison, can you talk about run-away Federal prosecutors; but I am telling you, never before in the history has there been such a scandalous misuse of the investigative process by the other side. And I hope, for the good of the country, I hope for the good of this Congress that it is never repeated.

My colleagues, the House, Mr. Speaker, over 120 witnesses either would not raise their hand and swear to tell the whole truth, they raised their hand and took the fifth amendment. Over 120 witnesses fled the country. We have never been able to conduct a thorough investigation. And the other side that calls for campaign reform, 98 percent of the violations were on their side of the aisle, 98 percent of the violations.

I submit that 98 percent of those serving in Congress obey the laws, they do not get into the gray area. They know there is a controlling legal authority. They have made a mockery of the law. And for them to campaign on campaign finance reform is a mockery. Because almost every one of the offenses that we see and we have seen, whether it is the Vice President at a Buddhist temple raising funds, whether it is making calls with no controlling legal authority, whether it is other gray areas and now we see that the White House has reported the use of the Lincoln Bedroom like a Motel 6, campaign contributions coming into various people running for high office here or there, and the lights are on at the Motel 6 White House.

So again, we have a very serious situation we have had to contend with on that committee attempting to conduct investigations and oversight in a responsible manner, whether it is campaign finance; whether it is Travelgate, which was one of the worst misuses and abuses of Federal authority planned, cooked, sealed, a misuse of that office, a misuse of professional White House employees abusing them in the fashion, and some of them have been compensated fortunately for that; whether it is Filegate.

And we can go back to Filegate. Do we still know? Do we still know? And our committee, under the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and other Members, investigated Filegate, the illegal use of hundreds and hundreds of personnel files obtained through the FBI into the White House.

Everybody knows what they were up to. We know they were trying to get dirt on their political opponents. We even know who did it. Now, do we know who hired Craig Livingston? We do not know to this date because this is the way these folks operated.

I had a conversation with a Democrat colleague, and the Democrat colleague and I shared our concern that a future administration might use the Clinton-Gore administration as a model in which to use the system, and that would be so sad for the future of the country.

Hopefully, we can banish the Clinton-Gore method of operation because the operation of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has always had involved bipartisan cooperation and people coming forward raising their right hand and telling the whole

truth to the committee so we could proceed, not taking the fifth amendment, not fleeing the country, not withholding information, shredding information, information disappearing, and only reappearing when we were able to get it somewhere else, information that unfortunately we have never been able to obtain.

So it is sad to come and have attacks against the chairman. And I will not say that, again, everything I have done is 100 percent. I make mistakes. I am human. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) makes mistakes. But I will tell my colleagues, he has done an incredible job.

The same method they used to go after everyone who questions or tries to hold them accountable is find dirt on them, try to expose them in some way with their friends in the press and belittle them and degrade them in public is sad. My Democrat colleague and I both share our concern that this is not the method of operation for future administrations whether they be Democrat or Republican.

So I take great exception.

I wanted to spend part of tonight, I usually talk on the drug issue, but following the ranking member and having background about how this committee, which I have served on since the first day I came to Congress and am knowledgeable about, I wanted to tell, as Paul Harvey says, the rest of the story.

Let me also mention while I have the floor that there are some funny things happening at this juncture. Of course, we are in a political time and people are talking about what they have done and what they have not done. And I think it is important to reflect.

I came into the Congress, again, as a minority Member in 1992. I was from the business sector. I am not an attorney. I came here because I was concerned about the future of the country, about us having a balanced budget, about the huge deficit we were running, about getting our country's finances in order.

I am pleased to come before my colleagues tonight to tell them that in fact we have been able to do that. And it was not done during my first term when there were huge numbers of majority from the other side. They did not bring spending under control. In fact, what they did was tax and spend more.

In a few weeks, the American people have an opportunity to decide whether they want to turn back to tax and spend or they want to remain on a sound fiscal basis, they want the finances of this country run like they would run their own finances so the income matches the outflow. And if they do not do that and they have a personal checkbook, they know exactly what happens, they keep spending and spending and they get further and further in debt.

Except they had the ability to tax. In 1993 and 1994, they did increase taxes on

the American people. They did not balance the budget. And we could not pin the President down on when we would balance the budget; and every time we made a proposal, he would come back with a different date and propose more government spending, more government programs, more control in Washington, more takeover here, and they did not balance the budget. They had their opportunity.

In fact, I remember them presenting their budget and for this fiscal year after they came to the floor and proposed the largest tax increase in the history of our Republic and told us this was going to balance the budget, they found in fact that the information they gave us for this year they would have had a \$200 billion deficit. That was their plan to this year have a \$200 billion deficit.

Now, something changed there. I will tell my colleagues what changed there. It was the Republican majority took control in 1995. And what we did was not anything special. It was not rocket science. It was not some magic formula from a Harvard economic Ph.D. We limited the annual increases, we still have allowed increases, and we matched it with our expenditures and income.

It was a simple plan. We balanced the budget. And we did that without harming senior citizens, without harming education, but actually by, and I will show in a few minutes, by helping education, by resetting priorities. Because this place basically had run amuck. The finances of the country were out of control.

Let me just tell my colleagues the way I found the House of Representatives running when I came here. The banking scandal, as my colleagues may recall, Members on both sides of the aisle would write checks and the bills would be paid by bouncing checks that were covered here really with taxpayer money.

The restaurant downstairs, the House restaurant, was run at a deficit and the food there for Members of Congress and their guests was subsidized.

I have given the example of ice being delivered and some 16 and 17 people working to deliver ice. Well, they instituted delivering ice to the Members' rooms back in the 1930s and 1940s before they had refrigerators and they were still spending three-quarters of a million dollars a year to deliver ice to the offices when I came here and had some 16 to 17 employees doing that.

I gave that speech many years ago, and someone could not believe it. I had to send them the documentation. He said I was not telling the truth. But that is how they ran the place. The place was in shambles. The House of Representatives, the people's House, was a disaster.

And I sat with a Member of Congress, a freshman Member, and I was telling

him the things that we have done since 1995 just starting here with the House of Representatives.

The first thing we did, and we said we would do it, was we cut the staff in the House of Representatives by one-third. That is what we started out with. We cut the staff by one-third. We cleaned out one building and a half a building on Capitol Hill of the huge bulk that the other side had taken on board and bulged the bureaucracy of the administration of Congress.

□ 1630

We cut the committees by a third. I took over the Civil Service subcommittee, which at one time Civil Service and Post Office had over 100 employees. I chaired Civil Service, and in fact we operated with seven staffers as opposed to more than 50 that had been devoted to the Civil Service subcommittee. So we cut the staff.

If you walk around the halls of Congress today in some of the House office buildings, you will see some empty rooms there that are there for meeting. They were formerly filled with this huge bureaucracy that the other side built up. That would be very sad to return to those days of yesteryear when they had control, when they misused their power.

We instituted many reforms in addition to cutting staff. Incidentally, since we cut the staff, we had a lot of parking spaces left over here because we did not have the 3,000 employees that were cut from the congressional payroll when we also cut the expenditures of the House of Representatives. So we turned that into a public parking lot. That parking lot actually has revenue into the House of Representatives. The subsidized dining room is now privately operated and not operated at a subsidy on the House side. A big change. The shoe shine stand, the barber shop, all of these things have been privatized and now accomplished. As I said, I sat with a freshman Member of Congress, he did not know, and if a freshman Republican Member of Congress does not know what we did, how can the American people or the rest of Congress remember the reforms that were instituted here in this House of Representatives?

One of the other great things that we have done, as long as I am going to spend a few minutes talking about, again, a contrast between the Republican control and the Democrat control, is our Nation's capital. Our Nation's capital was a disaster in 1993 to 1995 when the Democrats controlled the White House, the House and the Senate. It was a national shame. The murder rate approached some 400. There was a murder almost every weekend. Some weekends there were half a dozen murders here. There was slaughter in the streets of Washington. The public housing authority was bankrupt. The

children who were supposed to be protected, most protected, not at a disadvantage, were fed jello, rice and chicken for a month because they did not have money to pay the vendors.

Sometimes you had to boil your water in the District of Columbia. The morgue was not able to pay again for burying the indigent dead and bodies were stacked up like cord wood because they could not meet their obligations. This Congress was funding three-quarters of a billion dollars of deficit for the District of Columbia before the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives. Three-quarters of a billion dollars a year in debt. Marion Barry who was a disgrace to not only the capital but to the Nation, who set a horrible example for the young people here, he had employed some 60,000 employees. About one in every 10 people in the District of Columbia was employed by the District staff.

What did the Republicans do? This year we have nearly balanced the budget for the District of Columbia, first of all kicking and screaming and you would think we had imposed martial law but we did impose a control board over the District of Columbia. The District is our responsibility. It is a trust given to the Congress under the Constitution and we must work to try to maintain that trust as a good steward of the District. You do want home rule and we have tried to do that, but we did have to institute a control board. We have gotten some of the agencies, not all of them, in order. But the District again is running at a near balanced budget. They were spending more on education than any other entity in the United States on a per capita basis and performing at one of the lowest levels and we have turned some of that around.

We had to turn the water system over to another agency to operate. We have had to redo the District of Columbia building which once was a beautiful building and it looked like a Third World practically bombed out shelter when we took over. We have cut the employees from some 60,000 to in the mid-30,000 range, I believe, but we have dramatically decreased the number of employees in the District of Columbia. And we have cut the murders in the District. The person we brought in as the financial officer to oversee the District's finances and try to get them in order fortunately was elected the mayor and he has done an admirable job in bringing the District finances under control, and now we have returned most of the rule back to the District of Columbia.

But what a sad case. How sad it would be for the District of Columbia or for the American people to turn the Congress over, the running of the House of Representatives to the side that put it in such shame and disrepute, how sad it would be to turn the

District of Columbia back over to the people who had that stewardship and in some 40 years ran the District of Columbia into the ground. They were responsible. They failed. We took on that responsibility both to run this House, run the District, and I think we did an admirable job. So today, my colleagues, I think it is time that we remember as Members are prepared from the other side to come and bash what we have done, I want to put in the RECORD and let the Congress and the American people know what we have taken on as a responsibility.

I was appointed by Speaker Gingrich to be the chairman of the Civil Service subcommittee. I spoke about that a few minutes ago. I talked about some of the things we did with the Civil Service subcommittee. I am not here to tout my own horn but let me tell you, we took the Federal employees personnel office, which is the Office of Personnel Management, and in the 1993 to 1995 period, just go look at the statistics. Close to 6,000 employees in our personnel office, Office of Personnel Management. We were able to get that down to some 3,000 employees. And 1,000 of those employees, although there was kicking and screaming, there were Federal investigators, I was able, working with others, to turn that into an employee stock ownership plan. So we cut the number of employees. We took a thousand of those Federal investigators and turned that into an employee stock ownership company. I am sure you would not read about this but it is a success of again a Republican initiative and something that we should be very proud of. They now own that company. They now pay taxes, millions of dollars in taxes. They do business with the Federal Government, with other government agencies, with the private sector. But it is employee-owned. They fought kicking and screaming, but we did it.

We can cut government. We can cut bureaucracy. We can make things run more efficiently. I had never been chairman of Civil Service. I had never been to a Civil Service subcommittee hearing. Again, it does not take a lot of rocket science or a Harvard Ph.D. in economics or administration management, it just takes some common sense. And somehow in 40 years these people lost common sense.

Let me talk about one more thing that really got my gander last week. We had the President of the United States at the White House in a signing ceremony for long-term care. The President and the White House announced the statement that the President and the administration had passed long-term care for Federal employees and retirees and others in the Federal workforce. The President of the United States had the gall to say that this would serve as a model for the private sector. Little did the President of the

United States know the history of what had taken place on long-term care. Nor would his aides ever reveal this to the American public nor his press machine. But long-term care, ladies and gentlemen, when I became chairman of Civil Service was not ever on the radar screen. There was never ever a hearing in the Congress on long-term care. When I took over and I came from the private sector, I took over Civil Service, I started to look at some of the employee benefit programs. And coming from the private sector, I wondered why we did not have long-term care benefits for Federal employees. So I looked into it, and I actually conducted a hearing. The first hearing ever in the Congress was held on March 26, 1998, I chaired that, and I said, why do we not have long-term care as a benefit for Federal employees?

Now, this does not again take anything but common sense. I came from the private sector. Businesses I had been familiar with had proposals for long-term care for their employees. The bigger the business, the better discounts you can get. With 1.9 million Federal employees, with 2.2 million Federal retirees, with 1 million postal people and millions in the military, why could we not have a long-term care benefit for our Federal employees, go to an insurance carrier for long-term care and get a discounted rate for providing a group policy? I posed that.

"Oh, we can't do that. My goodness, we can't do that." The administration fought, kicked, opposed, blocked, did everything they could, said that this was a radical idea and fought us tooth and nail as we moved along or put impediments in the way.

Finally, the President signed the bill. I was not invited to the signing ceremony. There were other places I have not been invited to that probably would be more offensive to me, but we must set the record straight. And for the President of the United States to say that this would serve as a model for the private sector, well, to the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I must remind him that this idea came from the private sector. It was delivered through the person of Mr. MICA from Florida who held the first hearing on it and who introduced the first legislation on this August 4, 1998 and worked to try to get them to provide this simple benefit for one of the largest groups in the United States.

But Federal employees, Federal retirees, if you think that Bill Clinton or AL GORE did this for you, you need to have a serious counseling session with me and I will be glad to provide you the data. Of course he took credit for it and he had himself surrounded by people who did not have a whole lot to do with this particular issue.

Another issue, just to reflect as long as I am on the subject of a comparison

of the Republican administration, the new majority, I must say that the other side really has had a deficit in new ideas for some 47 years, long-term care being one of them. But again in chairing the Civil Service subcommittee, I looked at the benefits that Federal employees have, and I came again from the private sector, I had some term insurance I had acquired in the private sector and as you get older and if you have term insurance, you know you pay more for that term insurance, and I thought, well, why not add on? I am now a Federal employee. Even though I am a Member of Congress I fall in that category. Why not add on to the Federal employees life insurance benefits program? I could pay a little bit more in a group and have those benefits. Now I am in that employ, I do not have the private sector benefit, so I looked at the rates, and I said, "My God, they're paying higher rates for life insurance than I can get in the private sector."

□ 1645

I thought, something is dramatically wrong. So I conducted a hearing on Federal employee-retiree life insurance benefits. Come to find out, the other side had not bid the life insurance policy for 40 years. For 40 years they had not bid it; they only had one product available.

If you are even familiar in the slightest sense from the private sector of all the new options that are out there in insurance coverage, and you have a group of 1.9 million Federal employees and 2.2 million Federal retirees and other Federal employees, why could you not get a better rate with a group that size? A no-brainer. I talked to my friends in the insurance industry, and they said it was absurd not to have more choices. It was absurd to be paying those rates.

Now, we did make a little bit of progress. We have some more choices out there. Kicking and screaming, the Office of Personnel Management is coming into the 21st century, whether it is long-term employee health benefits, whether it is life insurance.

Let me just set up as a bit of warning something else that I found as Chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Service that is on everybody's radar screen. One of the most important things to me personally is that we find ways to provide health insurance coverage for all Americans.

I personally remember when I was in college and my brother was in college, we dropped out, my dad did not have health insurance, and we went to work and were able to help the family meet their financial requirements and then go back to school. But I know what it is like to be in a family that does not have health insurance, and there are millions of families that do not have health insurance.

My dad was a working American who did not have health insurance, so I know what it is like; and I think it is important that we as Republicans, that we as Democrats, that we as an Independent Member of this body, work to find ways to find access to health insurance coverage.

I oversaw the largest health care plan as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service in the country when I chaired that subcommittee, and I saw what this administration did to that program. It concerns me, because they are doing the same thing in prescription drugs; they are doing the same thing with HMOs and other reform.

What they are doing is they are bogging it down, they are packing on mandates, they are phrasing things like "Patients' Bill of Rights" and all of this that sounds good.

So I held hearings on what the administration was doing back several years now when I chaired this subcommittee. They came out with this Patients' Bill of Rights, and they could not get agreement in the Congress, so the President, by executive order, imposed the Patients' Bill of Rights on the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program.

I held a hearing and asked the people from the administration, what does this Patients' Bill of Rights do? Tell me what it does specifically. And each of them would say, well, it provides more paperwork, it is more regulation, it is more mandates.

I said, well, what medical benefit is there to all this? And they could not mention a specific medical benefit. But the President by executive order, which he has used so much because of the slim majority, and we do not have override ability here, imposed that on the employees health benefit program for the Federal Government, and not on all plans.

We had close to 400 plans at one time, before he imposed this, and he did not impose on it the most contentious part of the Patients' Bill of Rights, which is the right to sue. He imposed part of it, mostly the regulations and paperwork, I guess to make it look like he was doing something.

I will tell you what the result was. Instead of having, say, some 400 to choose from, we lost 60, 70 plans. When they added more mandates, we lost more plans. So many areas that needed that coverage for Federal employees out in the yonder started seeing fewer HMOs.

In addition, they saw the costs rise dramatically, and the private sector costs have not risen for health care plans anywhere near the extent, almost double digit for Federal employees, again with a system that the administration could get its hands around and sort of strangle, which they have done. So Federal employees, retirees, have seen these dramatic increases in costs

in premium, and also have fewer choices.

We have to be very careful that we do not do the same thing here with HMOs. I had a great letter from a constituent in my district. It was really a prize letter. I think it started out with "Dear Congressman MICA and you other dummies in Washington." He had sent it to not just me.

He said, you all are up there arguing about whether or not I have the right to sue my HMO, and he said you all are out in space, because I do not even have an HMO to sue. Three of them have disappeared.

That is a great concern to me, that something that was set up to provide health care on a cost-effective basis, that we do not destroy it.

Now, there are patient protections and things that can be written without damaging the intent and purpose of HMOs to provide access to health care, but we do not want more people like this who make a mockery of the ability to sue because he does not even have a plan he can go to. We see more and more plans being dissolved.

So if the Federal Government does continue to impose mandates, if we put on a Patients' Bill of Rights that only adds paperwork and regulations, and we increase the cost and we have fewer HMOs to choose from, the gentleman who wrote me, unfortunately, will be very correct. But he did have a great point: we cannot destroy something that is so important to us, and we have got to find ways.

It is interesting that we have some 30 or 40 million people who do not have health insurance coverage, and two-thirds of those people are working Americans. On our side of the aisle, again, kicking and screaming, we made the President sign welfare reform. I can tell you there is no way, if we had not boxed him into a corner, if it had not been close to the election, he ever would have signed welfare reform, but he did sign it. We have some 6 or 7 more million people working, thanks to the Republican initiative.

It is hard. I know it is easy to come here to come to Washington, to say I am going to give you this, free prescription drugs; you do not have to work; we will send you a welfare check from Washington, or through Washington, and you will be taken care of cradle-to-grave.

They tried that in the Soviet Union. They had it all cooked, and, unfortunately, the system was destroyed. You even see it in Europe and some countries that have these huge tax rates, unemployment, people not working, lack of productivity, and it is reflected now in their economies, as opposed to our's.

But we must address the people that we have taken from welfare to work and find a way that they can have access to affordable, quality health care.

I think that has to be through a partnership of the working individual on the basis of their ability to pay.

We also have to do that through the employer; and most of the employers who are providing these benefits are small businesses. The majority of businesses in this country, the vast majority, is not big, big business; it is small employers. A huge percentage of our population is employed by small business people. So business, the employer and government also has a responsibility, and it is something we can do.

They had their chance to balance the budget. They did not. What is interesting is this year, I believe we are going to have this year in excess of \$200 billion in surplus. They would have had by their plan which they submitted to us, I was here, a \$200 billion deficit. Not only would they have had a deficit, but they were also taking out of Social Security and putting in nonnegotiable certificates of indebtedness of the United States.

So here is the crew on the other side of the aisle that brought us these huge deficits, and all the finances of the country start right here in the people's body, in the House of Representatives. They had their chance to propose getting this right, but they now claim to say that they can do a better job.

If you believe that, I have a bridge in Brooklyn that I would like to sell you. These are the same folks that not only had us in a deficit position, had no way to get us out, tried to tax their way out, tried to spend their way out, and had projected for this year a \$200 billion deficit, their best guess, and we have a \$200 billion-plus surplus.

It has not been easy to do. Every time we have made a reform, they have thrown the kitchen sink at us, saying we are going to have people rolled out of nursing homes on the street, there will be breadlines in America, welfare reform is a cruel thing, to insist that people work and not stay on welfare.

But I submit that we have done an admirable job. One of the things you can do when you balance the budget is you can talk about prescription drug benefits, you can talk about adding more money to education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a few minutes about education, because I think that is important.

Now, I am a Republican Member of the House of Representatives. I come from a background, I actually have a degree in education from the University of Florida. I am very proud of that, and I never taught. I did my internship.

My wife was a public schoolteacher, taught elementary school in Corning, New York, and West Palm Beach when we moved and were married some 28 years ago, and she was a great teacher. I admire her ability with young people, and she has been a great mother to my two children, and I respect her judgment.

So she went to public schools, I went to public schools, we worked our way through college. I want to give that as a background. I am interested in education.

My grandparents were immigrants to this country. One was an Italian immigrant who came in after the turn of the century, worked in the factories and got into business in upstate New York. My grandfather on my father's side, they were Slovak immigrants from Slovakia, now a free and independent nation, once part of Czechoslovakia. They came to this country.

I will tell you, from the time I was a young child, I never heard anything repeated more in my family than get your education, that education is the most important thing. So the background of my family, again, came from immigrants, and they were intent on educating their children and grandchildren, and it was so important to us because they saw education and they saw it so rightly as the key to being able to function in a free democratic society that is dedicated to free enterprise. So education was a very, very important part of my family's background. I want to give that as a predicate.

Mr. Speaker, part of our work is trying to pass some 13 appropriations bills and do it in a responsible fashion. The contest is between the spenders, they had their chance to tax, and they could not impose any higher taxes on the American people because they are not in the majority. And the other alternative is spending, trying to keep the spending under control. The easiest thing for a politician to do is just spend more of the money and get it out of the people's hard-earned paycheck.

□ 1700

But, again, on the point of education, education has always been important to me. And once we get the finances of the country in order, once we get our personal finances in order, we can do a lot. We found that.

If I asked a question to Members of the House of Representatives, or of the Mr. Speaker today, who would do more financially for education, Republicans or Democrats, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, many people would respond, Democrats, because they are bigger spenders. But a strange thing happens when we balance the budget and have fiscal responsibility in Washington. We have more money, as I said, for prescription drugs; we have more money for education.

I can tell my colleagues that in the Republican Majority, K-through-12 funding has been a priority. Now, we only fund about 5 to 6 percent of all education dollars. The rest comes from local and State, usually from State governments through sales tax or other taxes at the State level or local property taxes. So we are the small contributor.

But these are the funding levels. Take a look at this. During the time the Democrats had control of the House of Representatives from 1990 to 1995, they increased spending for K-through-12 some 30.9 percent. If we have our financing in order, we can set priorities. We are not going further in the hole, and we are not robbing money out of Social Security, Medicare, or letting other programs go astray and here is what can be done. Under the Republican Majority from 1995 to 2000, we have increased the funds for education.

So we can do this with a balanced budget. We can put more money into education and the facts show that.

In fact, our side of the aisle has done that. Now, there is a big difference between the way we spend money and the way they spend money. Again, as a teacher, a former teacher-to-be, because, again, I never taught, but as a graduate of an education school and the husband of a teacher, I can tell my colleagues, and from talking to teachers throughout my district and anywhere I meet them, the last thing a teacher is able to do today is to teach. There are so many regulations, so many rules, so many restraints. There are so many court orders, so many edicts from Washington from the Department of Education, that the last thing a teacher can do is teach.

So this Republican majority has a difference. We have a difference in philosophy too about education. With Democrat control of the House of Representatives and the Congress, we found that nearly 90 percent of Federal dollars were going to everything except the classroom. We have first of all put more dollars into education, but also to have them go to the classroom and to the teacher. Those are the most fundamental differences between what the other side has proposed and what we propose and what this great debate is about.

They want that power; they want that control in Washington. They think Washington knows best. Better than parents, better than teachers, better than local school principals. In the meantime, they have created a bureaucracy. They have 5,000 people in the Department of Education; 5,000 people in the Department of Education.

Look at this administrative overhead. We have tried to get the dollars to education. They have tried and actually succeeded in getting the money to education administrative overhead. This is a chart from 1992 to the year 2000, and that has to be reversed. We do not need to be paying for a bureaucracy in Washington. Of the 5,000 people in the Federal Department of Education, somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000 are located just within a few miles of where I am standing here in Washington, our Nation's capital. Most of them are making between \$60,000 and \$110,000. I do not have teachers that are making \$60,000 and \$110,000.

So we have a simple philosophy. Get that money out of administrative overhead. And no matter what program they get into, when they took over the Congress to have a Direct Student Loan Program as opposed to having the private sector, and the costs every time have risen dramatically. Look at the costs back in 1993. It has absolutely mushroomed. This is in a student loan program.

So we have been able to put more money in education. We are trying to do it without strings. We are trying to do it without a huge bureaucracy. There were 760 Federal education programs when I came to Congress. We have got it down to somewhere, I think, just below 700. All well intended, as we will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of that committee, cite on the House floor. All well intended. But there is no reason why we cannot get that money back to the classroom, back to the teacher, back to basic education.

I tell my colleagues, and my wife will tell them as well as an elementary educator, students must be able to read, write, and do simple mathematics in order to succeed. And if students do not learn that at the earliest stage. I just saw, and I wanted to say President Bush, but Governor Bush's proposal and for what he did in Texas, what he has done in teaching young people to read, to write, to do mathematics. If we could duplicate this across the United States, what a great thing we would be doing for all young people, especially our minorities.

Again, we have to remember the value of education, to succeed in this country. Because if a student cannot read and write and do simple mathematics at the beginning, then they become the dropout problem, then they become the discipline problem. Then they are the social problem. Then they are sometimes even the prisoner problem and greater social problem that we face.

So Republicans have a very simple proposal. Get the money to the classroom. We have balanced the budget; we have additional resources. But not the control in Washington. Not the strangling. Let teachers teach. Do away with some of the Federal regulations.

We have seen it with charter schools. We have seen it with voucher systems. Voucher systems do not destroy public education; but they allow everyone, whether they are poor or black or Hispanic or white, whatever, to have an opportunity for the best possible education. And we find success, tremendous success in those programs in improvements in basic skills.

We have done it in the District. We helped clean up some of the District of Columbia problems. We have done it in the House of Representatives. We have done it with the Social Security program that was in disarray. We have



done it with our Federal balanced budget. We have tried to do it in a responsible manner. And here in education with our seven key principles: quality education, better teaching, local control, which is so important, accountability. It is so important to have education accountability, dollars to the classroom, not to the bureaucracy, not to administration, not to Washington control or mandates, but dollars to the classroom where they are most needed.

And not telling each school district they have got to use this money only for this or that. They know, the parents know, the principals know how to use those dollars.

Then parental involvement and responsibility. Responsibility which is so important in our society. Sometimes it is a word that is forgotten. No one wants to be responsible. And certainly we have had some 8 years of people not taking responsibility, of also promoting a nonresponsible society. That must change, because we must be responsible. We must be accountable. And our young people must also be ingrained with that philosophy if they are to succeed.

So we want to, again, take this message to the American people this afternoon, my fellow Members of Congress. We are pleased to compare what we have done, what we said we would do, and what we have accomplished and what we want to do for the future. We have a great model that we have presented.

Sure we have made mistakes. Republicans are human too. Sure, we have not done everything the way we should do. But I can tell my colleagues that this is not the time to turn to irresponsible management of the Congress, irresponsible management of the District of Columbia, irresponsible management over Social Security or Medicare that the other side let go. This is the time to be responsible, to have programs for the future based on sound experiences of the past.

Today, I have been able to hopefully outline some of what we have done; what I have been able to do as a Member of this distinguished body. And we are here to do the people's business and do it with honor, and on a bipartisan basis. But, again, the American people must be aware of the facts, particularly as we approach this most important generational election. This is a

critical election; and we do not want to turn back to 1993, 1994, 1995, to tax and spend and regulate and administrate from Washington in an irresponsible manner.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time for responsibility. It is the time for us to really reflect upon the accomplishments that we can point to at this juncture. With that, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you taking time and the staff taking time as the House concludes its business this afternoon and returns on Monday. Thank you so much for the opportunity to present this special order.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a Joint Resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BONIOR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. WAXMAN and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,820.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. Thomas, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 999. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2647. An act to amend the Act entitled "An Act relating to the water rights of the Ak-Chin Indian Community" to clarify certain provisions concerning the leasing of such water rights, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4700. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact.

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1295. An act to designate the United States Post Office located at 3813 Main Street in East Chicago, Indiana, as the "Lance Corporal Harold Gomez Post Office".

S. 1324. An act to expand the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Wills House, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 29, 2000, at 12 noon.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the fourth quarter of 1999, and first and second quarters of 2000, by Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the first quarter of 2000 are as follows: